REMARKS

Claims 36 and 38-52 are pending in the application. Claim 37 is canceled. Claims 1-35 and 53-61 are withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

I. INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant's representative wishes to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of September 2, 2009. The rejection of claim 36 as anticipated by Comer et al. was discussed. Although no agreement was reached, the Examiner stated that he was inclined to say that the embedded Internet server disclosed in Comer et al. does not meet the limitation of a print server to manage a print queue of claim 36. Withdrawal of the rejection is subject to the Examiner's review of the Internet server disclosed in Comer et al. in view of the remarks below.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

In the Office Action of July 20, 2009, claims 36, 38-41, and 44-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Comer et al. (US 7,212,300). Claims 42 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Comer et al. in view of Chadez et al. (US 6,522,420). Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the remarks herein are respectfully requested.

A. Claim 36

Claim 36 was rejected as anticipated by Comer et al. Applicant traverses the rejection. Claim 36 recites a substrate having a processor, a system I/O, a formatter controller, **and a print server** located thereon. As claimed, the print server is configured to "to manage a print queue". Comer et al. fails to teach or even suggest this limitation.

In the rejection, the final Office Action does not provide support for the assertion that Comer et al. discloses a print server that manages a print queue. Instead, the final Office Action states that Comer et al. discloses an embedded Internet server. However, managing Internet connectivity is considerably different from managing a print queue. In every instance that Comer et al. mentions any Internet server, the focus is solely on managing Internet connectivity, with no hint of managing anything remotely related to managing a print queue. Comer et al. discloses the following:

> Referring to FIG. 2, a typical preferred system may include a NetSilicon Ethernet processor 16. The processor may have ROM and RAM memory used to run software that will operate the Internet connection and perform the tasks required by the piezoelectric printhead. Processor 16 controls print engine 10 by managing the Internet communications and also by transforming message data received from the Internet into a format readable by the printer software.
>
> Print engine 10 preferably includes an Ethernet transceiver and magnetics that provide the physical connection to the Internet. Print engine 10 also includes specific electronics that are typical in the industry for operating a piezoelectric printhead. Print engine 10 monitors Internet communications and processes data intended for the device. In addition, the print engine performs the typical functions required of a piezoelectric printhead. (Comer et al., col. 4, lns. 3-18)

Comer et al. thus merely discloses that the printer is in communication with the Internet via an embedded Internet server. Comer et al. does not disclose a print server that manages a print queue.

The final Office Action states:

> It is well known in the art that web servers employ a cache/high speed buffer for temporary storage of data in order to reduce the amount of information that needs to be transmitted across the network. By disclosing a printer with an embedded print server, memory, and integrated networking software, Comer is implicitly revealing the existence of a print job because a print server by its very nature accepts print jobs from computers and sends the jobs to appropriate printers within e.g., a network.

Applicant disagrees with this statement and reasoning. Comer et al. does not disclose a printer with an embedded print server that manages a print server. As discussed above, Comer et al. discloses an Internet server. Even if one were to apply a broad meaning to "print server" the analysis does not end there because claim 36 recites that the print server **manages a print queue**. In other words, even if Applicant conceded (which Applicant does not) that an Internet server inside a printer can be referred to as a print server, it does not necessarily follow that an Internet server manages a print queue. The final Office Action imputes the function of managing the print queue to the Internet server is entirely without support by Comer et al. Simply, Comer et al. does not disclose anything, either explicitly or implicitly, that manages a print queue. Internet servers do not by their very nature manage print queues. And even if a printer receives print jobs over the Internet, that does not mean that the printer is managing a print queue.

The final Office Action states that print servers send print jobs to appropriate printers within e.g., a network. In effect, the Office Action asserts that the printer in Comer et al. has a print server that, when that printer receives a print job, sends the print job off to another printer. This assertion not only defies logic, but such a printer attribute is simply (and clearly) not disclosed in Comer et al.

The final Office Action cites Comer et al., col. 3, lns. 5-15 against claim 36. However, this section of Comer et al. while listing many common components of a chip, does not mention a print server that manages a print queue.

For the reasons stated above, claim 36 is believed allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 38-41 and 44-52 depend, either directly or indirectly, on claim 36 and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

B. Claim 48

Dependent claim 48 recites that the processor is configured to store a print job in a print queue. In rejecting claim 48, the final Office Action cites FIG. 4 of Comer et al. and states that "the memory (ROM and RAM) of the processor [is] used to store the instructions required by the processor so it may perform the functions necessary to print images with a printhead." However, the rejection does not state that Comer et al.

discloses that the processor is adapted to store a print job in a print queue, as claimed. FIG. 4 and the related text of Comer merely describe the traditional components of a printer that receives print jobs from, for example, an external print server that manages the print queue. Neither the cited text, nor FIG. 4, discloses that the embedded microprocessor of Comer stores print jobs in a print queue.

For these additional reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 48 be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, she is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/John R. Lagowski/
John R. Lagowski
Registration No. 41,922
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200